

REMARKS

Claims 46-48, 50 and 54-56 are pending, claims 26-45 and 51-53 having been canceled in response to the restriction requirement previously issued by the Examiner. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications on the subject matter of the canceled claims at the appropriate time.

Claim 49 has also been canceled without prejudice, as a result of the amendments to claims 46, 47 and 50, each of which now recites an additional characteristic or effect of the temporarily-applied rotating force, which occurs in response to operation of the external operating member; namely, that such force is set to such a magnitude as to cause the rotor of the electric power generator to be started up at a reference speed. Claim 46 has also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "rotor." Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and unclear in scope. Each of independent claims 46, 47 and 50 recites that a rotating force generated by operation of an external operating member is temporarily applied to a rotation target gear, transmission wheel train or rotor via a startup member or starter. Each of these claims then recites that the temporarily applied rotating force does not vary substantially regardless of the force applied to the external operating member. As amended herein, the temporarily applied rotating force is also set to such a magnitude as to cause the rotor of the electric power generator to be started up at a reference speed. It is respectfully submitted that each of these claims recites enough structure to support the recited relationship between operation of the external operating member and the characteristics or effects of the temporarily applied rotating force, particularly in view of the amendments made herein.

Moreover, applicants respectfully disagree with the presumption that *Schmidt* (US patent 6,483,276) must have the same capabilities as the present invention. *Schmidt* does not state nor imply that a resulting applied force does not vary substantially regardless of an initial force applied to an external member, nor that the resulting applied force is set to such a magnitude as to


cause the rotor wheel to be started up a reference speed. That is, *Schmidt* does not teach the relationship between operation of an external operating member and the temporary application of a force that is applied to a rotation target gear, etc., as recited in each of claims 46, 47 and 50. The electronically-controlled drive system of *Schmidt* involves applying a force to a compression coil spring that, in turn, applies force to a connected member that engages a translating gear, which rotates in response thereto and causes the rotor wheel of the drive system to start rotating. See *Schmidt*, Fig. 1 and col. 3, line 72 – col. 4, line 5. In *Schmidt*, the degree to which the compression coil spring flexes decreases gradually during start up, and, as a result, the force applied to the translating gear gradually decreases. Consequently, with his device, it is not possible to maintain the application of a constant force when the rotor is starting. Thus, *Schmidt's* simple starting mechanism actually teaches away from applicants' claimed invention, which enables the application of a constant force to a rotation target gear, etc. when it is getting started, so that a rotor is started up at a reference speed.

Turning to the art rejections, claims 46, 48, 49 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Schmidt* in view of U.S. patent 6,483,276 to *Shimizu et al.* Claim 47 stands rejected under this combination of references further in view of U.S. patent 4,939,707 to *Nagao*. This rejection is primarily based on the same reasoning as the § 112 rejection addressed above. Moreover, the latter two references are merely cited by the Examiner for a rotation controller/transmission wheel train and hands driven under its control and an electricity accumulator, that is, for features not directly related to the recited relationship between operation of the external operating member and the recited characteristics/effects of the temporarily applied rotating force. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 46, 47, 49 and 50 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references, and that dependent claim 48 is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Finally, applicants note with appreciation the indicated allowability of claims 54-56.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael T. Gabrik
Registration No. 32,896

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: September 15, 2005